

Amendments to the Drawing Figures:

The attached drawing sheet(s) include proposed changes to FIG(S) and replace(s) the original sheet(s) including FIG(S) .

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s)

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on October 4, 2007, and the references cited therewith.

Claim 2 is amended; as a result, claims 1-7 are now pending in this application.

§ 103 Rejection of the Claims

Independent claim 1 and claims 3-7 are respectively asserted to distinguish over Tetsuo et al and Roosendaal et al. Applicants remark, Tetsuo et al describes about the displaying apparatus provided with a pair of substrates, a first and second electrode, a color filter, an electro-optical layer and a reflective layer. Applicants further remark, Roosendaal et al describes a transfective liquid crystal display device, comprising a plurality of pixels, each comprising a liquid crystal layer sandwiched between front and back electrode. An optical $\lambda/4$ layer is arranged between front polarizer and liquid crystal layer.

In contrast, Independent claim 1 and claims 3-7 recite a transfective liquid crystal display device having an optical retarder at the viewer side of liquid crystalline cell to employ a dual-cell gap design, whereby the different cell gaps between the reflective and transmissive portions are structurally effected by means of the patterned retarder. Further, thickness of the optical retarder being such as to compensate a difference between the first cell gap and the second cell gap. Support for this can be found in figure 1 and in page 2, lines 15-20.

Applicants respectively assert that Tetsuo et al. and Roosendaal et al., references fail to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness because as mentioned above, the cited references fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of Applicants invention.

For the above reasons, claims 1 and 3-7 should be found to be allowable over Tetsuo et al. in view of Roosendaal et al.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 2 was amended accordingly. Thus claim 2 should be found allowable and such action is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Prakash Nama
Reg. 44,255
Att'y for Applicants
Global IP Services, PLLC
10 Crestwood Lane
Nashua, NH 03062

Phone: (603)-888-2352